THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

Writ Petition No. 26310 of 2006

Dated: 27.12.2006

Between:

B. Narasa Reddy, S/o Narsimha Reddy, aged about 54 years,
Occ: Junior Assistant (F), E.97810, Accounts Office, R/o Kadapa.

.... PETITIONER

AND

A.P.S.R.T.C., rep. by its Managing Director, Musheerabad, Hyderabad and others.

.....RESPONDENTS

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

Writ Petition No. 26310 of 2006

Order:

The petitioner states that as against the punishment orders dated 04.10.2006, passed by the 3rd respondent-Divisional Manager, ordering to recover an amount of Rs.18,954/- from his salary in 20 instalments towards pecuniary loss caused to the Corporation and reducing his pay by two incremental stages with cumulative effect and treating the suspension period as not on duty, he preferred appeal before the 2nd respondent-Executive Director (C & N), and the 2nd respondent-Executive Director (C & N), by proceedings dated 18.11.2006, partly allowed the same modifying the punishment to that of deferment of one annual increment with cumulative effect, and confirming the order of recovery of amount. Aggrieved by the said orders, he filed review petition before the

1st respondent-Managing Director on 14.12.2006 and requested him to suspend the operation of the punishment orders passed by the respondents 2 and 3, but so far no orders have been passed. Hence, he filed the present writ petition.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents-APSRTC.

The main contention advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the respondents-Corporation, without considering the review petition filed by the petitioner, are proceeding to implement the orders of punishment including the recovery of amount from the salary of the petitioner. He, thus, sought a direction from this Court to permit him to move appropriate application before the 1st respondent-Managing

Director for stay of the punishment orders passed by the respondents 2 and 3. Learned Standing Counsel for the respondents-APSRTC expressed no objection for the same.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, and in view of the agreed stand taken by both the counsel, I deem it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition with the following directions:

The petitioner is at liberty to move appropriate application before the 1st respondent-Managing Director seeking stay of the punishment orders passed by the respondents 2 and 3, and on such application being filed, the 1st respondent-Managing Director shall consider the same and pass appropriate orders thereon in accordance with law, expeditiously, preferably within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of said application.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

_____

N.V. RAMANA, J.

Date: 27.12.2006
NSR/ISL